

REMARKS

In response to the requirement for election of one of the following species:

- species I shown in figures 1-4;
- species II shown in figure 5;
- species III shown in figure 6; and
- species IV shown in figure 7;

applicant elects the prosecution of the species of group II shown in figure 5, and transverses the restriction requirement as described below.

All the claims 1-18 read on the species of Group II shown in figure 5.

Claims 1-4 and 7-18 are all generic to all the species.

Applicant traverses the restriction requirement because according to MPEP 803 "There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions (A) ... ; and (B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required ..." In this case there is no serious burden on the examiner to examine all the species because there is a reasonable number of species and a search of the inventions of the elected group of inventions will also be sufficient for the examination of the non-elected groups of inventions regardless that they may be in different USPTO classifications.

Applicant also traverses the restriction requirement because according to MPEP 806.04(f) "Claims to be restricted to different species must be mutually exclusive. The general test as to when claims are restricted, respectively, to different species is the fact that one

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael E. Belk
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Attorney
(914) 333-9643



Creation date: 12-08-2004
Indexing Officer: YAMHA - YOSEPH AMHA
Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing
Dossier: 10020054

Legal Date: 03-30-2004

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	SRNT	1

Total number of pages: 1

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on